REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-27 remain in this application.

Objections to the application

Applicants have amended the title of the invention in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants have amended Figures 3a and 3b to eliminate confusion of the numbering of the elements. Applicants have amended appropriate sections of the specification in view of the amendments to the drawings.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over various combinations of Jones (U.S. Publication 2002/0120678 in view of Malik (U.S. Patent 7,003,551). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention introduces unique functionality whereby there is a substantial reduction in the storage and replication requirements for the locally initiated electronic mail messages, which include locally sourced attachments. In the method of the present invention, at the origination location of an electronic message, there is an identification of electronic messages containing locally sourced attachment documents. During the storage of the transmitted message, there is determination of whether any attachment to the message was a locally sourced attachment. If the attachment was a locally sourced attachment, the attachment may not be stored with the message. Instead a pointer or link can be created to the original or locally sourced document. This approach will reduce the storage space required by electronic messages.

In Jones a client local storage is provided that exists on a client machine but is accessible by a server. The client local storage allows the server to "push" the actual storage of data files to the client machine. Users may then contribute local storage toward maintaining useful, but non-critical files without burdening the server for storage and backup facilities. Thus, the server may decide to push data, such as large attachments, to client local storage. Client local storage may also be used for archival of older versions of files.

Malik provides an e-mail communications system that minimizes the number of duplicate copies of common attachment files to e-mail communications that are stored in the mail store of an e-mail server. When the e-mail server receives an e-mail attachment file that is larger than a threshold size, the server performs a database search for another copy of the attachment file in the mail store. If another copy is located, the system creates a pointer in the mail store that associates the located attachment file with the e-mail for the additional recipient(s). Attachment files are deleted only after the recipients of the associated e-mail communications delete each of the respective e-mails.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness. As indicated above, Jones, the primary reference, fails to teach the steps of:

deleting an attachment that originated at the destination location of the electronic message; and creating a link to the original document located at the destination location of the electronic message.

Malik fails to describe these deficiencies. Malik teaches the method of examining emails received from different sender than the original sender. The present invention teaches examining the attachments of the one sending the original message. Thus, Malik fails to teach the missing limitations. Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Jones with Malik, and such a combination would fail to provide the missing limitations. Thus, Jones alone or in combination with Malik fails to support a finding of obviousness.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Darcell Walker
Reg. No. 34,945
P. O. Box 25048
Houston, Texas 77265
713-772-1255